UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ANTHONY FREITAS

Plaintiff

v.

RADIOSHACK CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

05 11343 RWZ

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Defendant RadioShack Corporation ("RadioShack") hereby gives notice of the removal of the case described below to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1446. In support of this removal petition RadioShack states the following:

I. INTRODUCTION

This case arises from the termination of Plaintiff's employment by RadioShack on or about July 29, 2003.

On or about June 3, 2005, Plaintiff filed a complaint alleging discrimination on the basis of disability/handicap in violation of M.G.L. c. 151B, § 4(16) and wrongful discharge in the Superior Court Department of the Trial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Middlesex County, Case Number 05-1838. On June 7, 2005, RadioShack was served with a Summons and Complaint, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit A. RadioShack is required to file a pleading in response to the Complaint on or before June 27, 2005.

As RadioShack more fully states below, removal of this matter is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 based on diversity jurisdiction.

II. DIVERSITY JURISDICTION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), this Court has original jurisdiction over actions between citizens of different states where the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds \$75,000.

Plaintiff is a citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who resides in Waltham, Massachusetts.

RadioShack is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business in Fort Worth, Texas. Defendant, therefore, is a citizen of the State of Texas.

Plaintiff is claiming damages including lost wages, attorneys' fees, costs and expenses, economic injury and other harm. Plaintiff's claim for damages, therefore, exceeds \$75,000. exclusive of interest and costs.

Because Plaintiff is a citizen of Massachusetts and Defendant is a citizen of Texas, this Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1).

III. OTHER REMOVAL MATTERS

RadioShack reserves the right to amend or supplement this Notice of Removal.

There have been no pleadings served upon RadioShack other than the Summons and Complaint.

This Notice of Removal is filed within 30 days of service upon RadioShack of the Summons and Complaint in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), RadioShack shall give Plaintiff written notice of the filing of this Notice of Removal and shall file a written notice of this Notice of Removal with the Clerk of the Superior Court Department of the Trial Court for the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts, Middlesex County, Massachusetts, attaching a file stamped copy of this Notice of Removal.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1446 this action is removable to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

WHEREFORE, RadioShack gives notice that Anthony Freitas v. RadioShack Corporation, Superior Court Department of the Trial Court Civil Action Number 05-1838 is removed to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

RADIOSHACK CORPORATION

By its attorneys,

(617) 523-6666

Jeffrey S. Siegel (BBO# 647148) MORGAN, BROWN & JOY, LLP 200 State Street Boston, MA 02109-2605

Dated: 6/27/05

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel for plaintiff, Ara H. Margosian II, Esq., 415 Mt. Auburn Street, Watertown, MA 02472, by first-class U.S. mail this 27th day of June 2005.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	Title of	itle of case (name of first party on each side only)Freitas v. Radioshack Corporation											
١.		case (IIali	e of thist party off each side	y)							2-14		
2.	Categor	y in whic	h the case belongs based up	on the numb	ered natur	e of suit	code	listed on	the civi	1 cove	r sheet.	(See loca	I
	rule 40.	•						H. W					
		ι.	160, 410, 470, 535, R.23, R	EGARDLESS	OF NATUR	E OF S		•		1 175	124,6		
	[u.	195, 196, 368, 400, 440, 44 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 8	1-446, 540, 5! 340*, 850, 890	50, 555, 625 , 892-894, 8	, 710, 72 95, 950.	20, 730					O 121 pyright cas	es
		M.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 19 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 35 380, 385, 450, 891.	0, 210, 230, 2 0, 355, 360, 3	40, 245, 290 62, 365, 370	0, 310, 0, 371,							
		IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 48 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 87	0, 490, 510, 5 1, 875, 900.	30, 619, 62	0, 633 , 6	40, 65	660	3	4	3	RW	
		٧.	150, 152, 153.		Ψ)			2F4 "					
3.	Title an district None.	please in	r, if any, of related cases. (S dicate the title and number o	ee local rule of the first file	40.1(g)). If ed case in t	more the	an one	e prior re	lated ca	se has	been fil	led in this	
4.	Has a p	rior actio	n between the same parties	and based or	n the same	claim ev	er be	en filed i	n this co	urt?			
						,	YES		NO	✓]		
5.	Does th	e compla	int in this case question the	constitution	ality of an a	ct of co	ngres	s affectir	ng the pu	ıblic ir	nterest?	(See 28 l	JSC
	92400)					,	YES	20170140021001	NO	1			
	If so, is	the U.S.	A. or an officer, agent or emp	loyee of the	U.S. a party	?		Academic A		Lucian	-A		
						,	YES		NO				
6.	ls this d	case requ	ired to be heard and determi	ined by a dist	trict court o	f three j	udges	pursuar	nt to title	28 US	SC §2284	1 ?	
						,	YES		NO	V	}		
7.			ies in this action, excluding "governmental agencies"),										d)).
						,	YES	1	NO	Γ			
		A.	If yes, in which division d	o all of the no	on-governm	ental pa	arties	reside?		*******	,,,		
			Eastern Division		Central Divi	ision			Wes	stern [Division		
		В.	If no, in which division do residing in Massachusetts		of the plair	ntiffs or	the on	ily partie	s, exclud	ding g	overnme	ental agend	ies,
			Eastern Division		Central Div	ision			Wes	stern [Division		
8.	•		of Removal - are there any meters and the sheet identifying the motion	_	ng in the st	ate cou	rt requ	uiring the	attentic	on of t	his Cour	t? (If yes,	
						,	YES		NO	\]		
Pi	EASE T	YPE OR I	PRINT)										
			Jeffrey S. Siegel										
	DRESS		an, Brown & Joy, LLP, 20	00 State St	reet, Bost	on, MA	021	09					
ΤE	LEPHON	IE NO6	17-523-6666										
										(Cate	goryFor	n.wpd - 5/2/	05)

*5JS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

l. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS		1.1				
Anthony Fr	eitas	Radioshack Corpo	Radioshack Corporation					
		,	1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff Middlesex (CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	County of Residence o	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Ft. Worth, TX (Tarrant Cou					
(1	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
(a) Attornov's /Firm Nove	Address and Talanhona Niumbar)	Attorneys (If Known)						
	Address, and Telephone Number)	Morgan, Brown &	Toy LIP. A A	3 RWZ				
Ara H. Margosian II, P.C. 415 Mt. Auburn St., Wate	rtown, MA 02472	200 State Street, 11		2100				
II. BASIS OF JURISD				(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)				
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	P	TF DEF 1	PTF DEF incipal Place 🗸 4 🗇 4				
☐ 2 U.S. Government	💋 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	2 2 incorporated and I					
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In	Another State				
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	76 76				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES				
7 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY	☐ 610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment				
120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 620 Other Food & Drug ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking				
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 881		☐ 450 Commerce				
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability Slander ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	☐ 630 Liquor Laws ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and				
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	☐ 650 Airline Regs.	☐ 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations				
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY	660 Occupational Safety/Health	3 840 Trademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV				
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Lending	☐ 690 Other LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/				
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchange				
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	7 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt, Relations	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	7 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410				
195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability	☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts				
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS	☐ 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	391 Agricultural Acts 392 Economic Stabilization Act				
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate	☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	5 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act				
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	7 871 IRS -Third Party	895 Freedom of Information				
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations		26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination				
7 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other	1	ŀ	Under Equal Access				
	Employment		ļ	to Justice 13 950 Constitutionality of				
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights			State Statutes				
Original 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	Reinstated or another						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of cause: Employment Discrimination	2(d)						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$ 000.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint:				
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER					
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY OF RECORD						
06/22/2005	x A.M.							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	797	7						
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE _	MAG. JUI	DGE				

Case 1:05-cv-11343-RWZ Document 1-3 Filed 06/27/2005 Page 1 of 14 00 8 200

TO PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY: PLEASE CIRCLE TYPE OF ACTION INVOLVED: —
TORT — MOTOR VEHICLE TORT — CONTRACT —
EQUITABLE RELIEF — OTHER

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX , ss	
[seal]	

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT CIVIL ACTION

Anthony Freitas , Plaintiff(s)

v.

Radioshack CorporationDefendant(s)

SUMMONS

	To the above-named Defendant:
	You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Ara H. Margosian II, P.C.
	plaintiff's attorney, whose address is 415 Mt. Auburn
	St., Watertown, MA 02472 , an answer to the complaint which is herewith
	served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you
	fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You are also
	required to file your answer to the complaint in the office of the Clerk of this court atMiddlesex
	reasonable time thereafter.
	Unless otherwise provided by Rule 13(a), your answer must state as a counterclaim any claim which you may
	have against the plaintiff which arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the plaintiff's
	claim or you will thereafter be barred from making such claim in any other action. Barbars J. Rouse Witness, Suzanne V. DelVecchio, Esquire, at
	the June
	in the year of our Lord 2005
us ×	Color Property Sheriff, Swiffolk County
7/	19 Deputy starm, same alway full war
	Clerk

NOTES.

- 1. This summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 2. When more than one defendant is involved, the names of all such defendants should appear in the caption. If a separate summons is used for each defendant, each should be addressed to the particular defendant.

CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET	SUPERIOR COU	of Massachusetts RT DEPARTMENT Middlesex	Docket Number
PLAINTIFF(S)	The state of the s	DEFENDANT(S)	hack Corporation
Anthony Freitas	AND TELEPHONE		hack Corporation
ATTORNEY, FIRM NAME, ADDRESS Ara H., Margosian II, La	w Offices of Ara	ATTORNEY (if known) H. Margosian,	
415 Mount Auburn St., Wa Board of Bar Overseers number: 56	tertown, MA 0247	2 (617) 926-8944	state (see a constitution of the second
ent i	Origin code and I	rack designation	
Place an x in one box only: [XX] 1. F01 Original Complaint [2. F02 Removal to Sup.Ct. c. 23 (Before trial) [] 3. F03 Retransfer to Sup.Ct. C.2	66%	(X)	
		ESIGNATION (See reverse	
CODE NO. TYPE OF ACTIO	N (specify) TRACK	IS THIS A JURY	CASE?
B22 Employment Dis	crimination (F)	(xx) Yes () No.
The following is a full, itemized money damages. For this form	and detailed statemer , disregard double or	nt of the facts on which p treble damage claims, in	laintiff relies to determine dicate single damages only.
	TORT	LAIMS	The Art of
 Total chiropractic expenses (Total physical therapy Total other expenses (enses to date: es enses enses expenses (describe)		\$ \$
 B. Documented lost wages at C. Documented property dan D. Reasonably anticipated fur E. Reasonably anticipated lost F. Other documented items of 	nages to date ture medical and hosp st wages	oital expenses	
G. Brief description of plaintif	fs injury, including na	ture and extent of injury	(describe)
The Plaintiff was di by the Defendant due	scriminated aga: to his handica	inst and wrongfull	y terminated \$75,000.00
<u> St. Burner William College St. St.</u>	<u> </u>	er in the Control of	TOTAL: \$79,000.00
Provide a detailed description o	f claim(s):	ieets as necessary)	
PLEASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBI COURT DEPARTMENT	ER, NAME AND COUNTY	, ANY RELATED ACTION F	PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR
I hereby certify that I have com Jniform Rules on Dispute Reso about court-connected dispute r disadvantages of the various me Signature of Attorney of Record	esolution services and ethods.") requiring that i provide	e my clients with information

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX, ss	NO. 5-183
ANTHONY FREITAS) Plaintiff)	
v.)	
RADIOSHACK CORPORATION,) Defendant)	COMPLAINT

PLAINTIFF REQUESTS A JURY TRIAL ON ALL TRIABLE ISSUES

PARTIES

- The Plaintiff, Anthony Freitas (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), a natural person,
 resides at 37 Melvern Street, Waltham, Massachusetts, Middlesex County,
 Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- 2. The Defendant, Radioshack Corporation (hereinafter "Defendant"), a Delaware Corporation with a principal place of business at 100 Throckmorton Street, #1800, Fort Worth, Texas and its registered agent is Corporation Service Company of 84 State Street, Boston, Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

FACTS

- On or about January 17, 2003, the Plaintiff began his employment as a sales associate for the Defendant.
- The Plaintiff was employed as a sales associate at the Waltham branch located at 852 Lexington Street, Waltham, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

- 5. He was employed as a full-time employee and was working at least forty (40) hours a week, with a five (5) day work week.
- The Plaintiff's initial interview was conducted at the RadioShack location in 6. Harvard Square, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 7. The Plaintiff was immediately offered a position with the Defendant.
- The Plaintiff was required to complete further paperwork at Defendant's 8. regional office located on Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts, upon being hired.
- At the Defendant's regional office, the Plaintiff had to complete a job form 9. where he disclosed that he suffered from Type 1 diabetes.
- 10. The Plaintiff has suffered with Type 1 diabetes since 1998.
- The Plaintiff was promoted to the position of Assistant Manager, after a few 11. months on the job, and was given an American Express gift certificate to reward his hard work and high sales.
- Due to his hard work, the Plaintiff was given a .5% raise to his commission 12. percentage.
- The Defendant's local Waltham branch had only two employees working 13. there, during the months of March and April, 2003.
- 14. The Plaintiff often worked fifty (50) hours a week, due to his indispensability.
- The Plaintiff was asked by a supervisor at the Defendant's Waltham branch to 15. work off-the-clock for any time exceeding forty (40) hours so that he would not qualify for overtime, although he was paid by the hour.
- 16. The Plaintiff adhered to that request.

- 17. The Plaintiff remained in good health for the first six (6) months of his employment with the Defendant.
- 18. Due to his Type 1 diabetes, the Plaintiff was required to use insulin two (2) to three (3) times per day on the job.
- 19. The Plaintiff never needed any additional time or other accommodations to tend to his disability, during the first six (6) months of his employment.
- 20. During that first six (6) months, the Plaintiff requested and took one (1) day off to attend his brother's wedding on or about April 26, 2003.
- 21. The Plaintiff had advised a representative of the Defendant Corporation of that wedding, prior to accepting employment there.
- 22. The Plaintiff made four (4) requests to not be put on the schedule for certain dates and times so that he could attend his routine doctor's appointments, during the first six (6) months of his employment.
- 23. Throughout the Plaintiff's employment, he received two minor "write-ups', one (1) for missing a Saturday meeting, and one (1) for arriving to work fifteen (15) minutes late.
- 24. The Plaintiff became ill in July, 2003 with Ketoacidosis, an illness experienced by many Type 1 diabetics.
- 25. Symptoms of Ketoacidosis include abnormal or excessive thirst, nocturia, and polyuria, as well as possible malaise, nausea, fatigue and confusion.
- 26. In the six years that the Plaintiff suffered from Type 1 diabetes, he was afflicted with Ketoacidosis approximately five (5) times.

- 27. The Plaintiff becomes sick to his stomach, cannot walk, has difficulty breathing, shakes and often vomits, due to Ketoacidosis.
- 28. In July, 2003, the Defendant's Waltham branch was employing three (3) associates and one (1) manager, including the Plaintiff.
- 29. The Plaintiff requested, on more than one occasion, permission to leave work early due to the fact that he was not feeling well, those requests were denied by his supervisor.
- 30. The Plaintiff's condition worsened, he was unable to work on one particular day.
- 31. The Plaintiff complied with the Defendant's guidelines and informed his manager that he would be unable to work, at least one (1) hour before his shift was scheduled to commence.
- 32. During the month of July, 2003, it was necessary for the Plaintiff to cancel his shift six (6) times due to his aggravated medical conditions.
- 33. The Plaintiff was unable to work due to his condition, on or about July 27, 2003.
- 34. The Plaintiff arrived at the Defendant's Waltham branch the following day, his manager, Dave Nolan (hereinafter referred to as "Mr. Nolan"), sent the Plaintiff on an errand to another store and then asked to meet with him.
- 35. Mr. Nolan explained that he had spoken to the district manager of the Defendant Corporation about the Plaintiff's absences due to his illness.
- 36. Mr. Nolan stated that he understood that the Plaintiff was sick and that he had diabetes.

- 37. Mr. Nolan then told the Plaintiff that he was removing him from the daily work schedule.
- 38. The Plaintiff inquired how long he would be removed from the schedule.
- 39. Mr. Nolan then stated that the Plaintiff would be removed permanently from the daily work schedule.
- 40. The Plaintiff then asked if it would be helpful if he brought in doctor's notes to show that he was indeed ill.
- 41. Mr. Nolan informed the Plaintiff that that would not help.
- 42. The Plaintiff then inquired if it would be helpful if he called the District

 Manager directly.
- 43. Mr. Nolan responded that it would not help and that they could not have him working there.
- 44. The Plaintiff believed that he was being removed from the schedule temporarily, however, Mr. Nolan informed the Plaintiff that he did not want the Plaintiff to work there any longer and his employment was terminated on July 29, 2003.

COUNT I DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF DISABILITY/HANDICAP IN VIOLATION OF M.G.L. CH. 151B § 4(16)

- 45. The Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference all information set forth in Paragraphs 1-44 above as if set forth in their entirety.
- 46. The Defendant discriminated against the Plaintiff on the basis of the Plaintiff's disability.

- 47. The Plaintiff suffers from Type I Diabetes, and has suffered from this disability since 1998.
- 48. The Plaintiff is handicapped within the meaning of M.G.L. Ch. 151B § 1.
- 49. The Plaintiff is a handicapped person "who is capable of performing the essential functions" of his/her job, or who would be capable of performing them with or without reasonable accommodation to his handicap.
- The Plaintiff is a qualified handicapped person within the meaning of M.G.L. Ch.151B §1(16).
- 51. The Plaintiff was terminated by the Defendant Corporation on or about July 29, 2003.
- 52. The position that the Plaintiff had filled remained open.
- 53. The Plaintiff made the Defendant Corporation aware of the disability prior to beginning his employment.
- 54. The Plaintiff made every attempt to follow the Defendant's procedure as it related to providing notice for missed work due to his handicap.
- Mr. Nolan, an employee of the Defendant Corporation, informed the Plaintiff that the Defendant could not continue to employ him because of his illness which is a handicap pursuant to M.G.L. Ch. 151B§1.
- 56. As the direct and proximate result thereof, the Plaintiff has incurred lost wages, attorney's fees, costs and expenses, economic injury and other harm.

COUNT II WRONGFUL TERMINATION

- The Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference all information set forth in 57. Paragraphs 1-56 above as if alleged herein their entirety.
- The Defendant terminated the Plaintiff's employment on July 29, 2003. 58.
- 59. The Defendant Corporation was aware of his disability when the Plaintiff was hired.
- When the Plaintiff became ill, he requested that he be permitted to leave early 60. on occasion and those requests were denied.
- The Plaintiff's disability did not affect his work performance and when he was 61. able to work, his work was exemplary.
- The Plaintiff was released because of his disability and for no other reason. 62.
- The Defendant's actions and inactions are the direct and proximate cause of 63. the Plaintiff's injuries and damages.

As the direct and proximate result thereof, the Plaintiff has incurred lost wages, attorney's fees, costs and expenses, economic injury and other harm.

Wherefore, the Plaintiff requests that this Honorable Court:

- Grant a judgment for the Plaintiff against the Defendant on all counts; a)
- Award the Plaintiff damages; b)
- Award the Plaintiff fees, costs and legal expenses; and c)
- Any other award that this Court deems just and proper. d)

Respectfully Submitted, PLAINTIFF, Anthony Freitas, By his Attorney

Ara H. Margosian II BB0 # 560556

The Law Office of Ara H. Margosian II, PC 415 Mt. Auburn Street Watertown, MA 02472 (617) 926-8944

May 24, 2005

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT

ANTHONY FREITAS
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 05-1838

RADIOSHACK CORPORATION Defendant.

NOTICE OF FILING NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CIVIL ACTION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants in the above-captioned matter, have on the 27th day of June 2005 filed in the United States District Court of the District of Massachusetts their Notice of Removal of the above-styled action from the Superior Court, Middlesex County, Cambridge, Massachusetts (a copy of said Notice is attached hereto) to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, at Boston, Massachusetts, together with copies of the Complaint filed by the Plaintiff in the Superior Court, Middlesex County, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

You are also advised that said Defendants, upon filing said Notice, filed a Notice of Removal to Federal Court with the Clerk, Superior Court, Middlesex County, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and attached thereto copies of the following: (1) Notice of Removal with exhibits attached thereto; and (2) the Notice to Counsel of Removal of Action to Federal Court.

Such action has effected the removal of this action to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446 and no further proceedings may be had in this state court action.

Respectfully submitted,

RADIOSHACK CORPORATION

By its attorneys,

Diane Saunders (BBO# 562872)
Jeffrey S. Siegel (BBO# 647148)
MORGAN, BROWN & JOY, LLP
200 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-2605
(617) 523-6666

Dated: June 27, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel for plaintiff, Ara H. Margosian II, Esq., 415 Mt. Auburn Street, Watertown, MA 02472, by first-class U.S. mail this 27th day of June, 2005.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ANTHONY FREITAS

Civil Action No.

Plaintiff

NOTICE TO COUNSEL OF REMOVAL OF ACTION TO FEDERAL COURT

v.

RADIOSHACK CORPORATION,

Defendants.

05 11343 RW7

To: Ara H. Margosian II, Esq. 415 Mt. Auburn Street Watertown, MA 02472

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants in the above-captioned matter, have on the 27th day of June, 2005 filed in the United States District Court of the District of Massachusetts their Notice of Removal of the above-styled action from the Superior Court, Middlesex County, Cambridge, Massachusetts (a copy of said Notice is attached hereto) to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, at Boston, Massachusetts, together with copies of the Complaint filed by the Plaintiff in the Superior Court, Middlesex County, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

You are also advised that said Defendants, upon filing said Notice, filed a Notice of Removal to Federal Court with the Clerk, Superior Court, Middlesex County, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and attached thereto copies of the following: (1) Notice of Removal with exhibits attached thereto; and (2) the Notice to Counsel of Removal of Action to Federal Court.

Such action has effected the removal of this action to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446 and no further proceedings may be had in this state court action.

Respectfully submitted,

RADIOSHACK CORPORATION

By its attorneys,

Diane Saunders (BBO# 562872) Jeffrey S. Siegel (BBO# 647148) MORGAN, BROWN & JOY, LLP 200 State Street

Boston, MA 02109-2605 (617) 523-6666

Dated: June 27, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel for plaintiff, Ara H. Margosian II, Esq., 415 Mt. Auburn Street, Watertown, MA 02472, by first-class U.S. mail this 27th day of June, 2005.